



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN IN SOPHOCLES

PART I

DISTRIBUTION AND PROPORTION

It has been said that the world needs not so much to be instructed as to be reminded. It is in this spirit that these statistics on the distribution and proportion of the demonstrative pronouns in Sophocles are presented.

This paper on οὗτος, ὅδε and ἐκεῖνος (the traditional order in the grammars) grew out of some remarks by Professor Gildersleeve in divers places in *The American Journal of Philology*, in which he desiderated more definite information about these pronouns. Perhaps, therefore, it will not be amiss to quote the passages in full.

“Οὗτος is the universal demonstrative; the others are all particular; it is the regular antecedent of the relative, and with it the relative is ‘that.’ With the others, ὅδε and ἐκεῖνος, it is rather ‘who’ or ‘which.’ In practical use ὅδε sets up an opposition to οὗτος, gets to itself the connotation of the important first person, but it is only in dramatic style that ὅδε can make head against οὗτος, and it is the large use of ὅδε that gives so much of the conversational tone to Herodotus. To be sure, ἐκεῖνος gives bulk, gives weight, but it lacks precision. It is a ‘yon,’ which is as vague as the next world to which it is always assigned, and great hulking demonstrative that it is, it needs the guidance of ὅδε and οὗτος, οὗτος ἐκεῖνος, ὅδ’ ἐκεῖνος ἐγώ. All these are the commonplaces of grammar. But, of late, scholars have thought it worth while to watch the usage of so familiar a pronoun as οὗτος in the Attic orators, and have formulated

delicate regularities unformulated before;¹ and a theory as to the composition of the works of Thukydides has been based on the shifting position of ὅδε, on ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε and ὅδε ὁ πόλεμος.² 'This' and 'that' in English are not so simple as might be supposed. Foreigners do not always master them perfectly; a German friend of mine always said 'one of those days,' and the use of *este* and *ese* is said to be the Spanish shibboleth. No one, however blunt his senses, is indifferent to the final *ι* in ὀδί and οὔτοσί, and it is not unprofitable to train the perceptions to catch the difference." (*A. J. P.* xxxiii, p. 124.)

And again:

"For instance, οὔτος in the Antigone yields only 42 per cent. as against 58 for ὅδε: in the Prometheus οὔτος is to ὅδε as 29 to 71. In the Orestes οὔτος : ὅδε :: 23 : 77, and in the I. T., there are four times as many ὅδε's as οὔτος's (*A. J. P.* xxvii, 327), so that a mechanical soul might be tempted to suspect the iambic metre, in which ὅδε has manifestly a great advantage over οὔτος. ὅδε yields a great array of trochaic forms and convenient monosyllables against the beggarly account of οὔτος, τοὔτον, τοὔτ(ο), ταὔτ(α). Add the gesture of the stage, the shift of οὔτος and ὅδε, say, from the right hand to the left, and the thing becomes perfectly simple, if it were not for Aristophanes. But a glance at the old Caravella index of Aristophanes will effectually dispel any illusion as to the predominance of ὅδε in iambic metre. Iambic metre may delight in words with a short penult, but there are other considerations besides *metri causa*; and crimes are committed in the name of metrical slavery as well as in the name of civil liberty. . . .

"But not to dwell on such φλυαρίαι, to use a mild expression, the contrast in numbers between ὅδε and οὔτος in tragedy and comedy is sensible enough, but it would be dangerous to generalize as to the contrast in usage. True, we should expect greater exactness in comedy, as comedy comes nearer to real life, but even in

¹ See Blass, *Rh. Mus.* Vol. XLIV, *A. J. P.* XI, 107.

² See Herbst as summarized in *A. J. P.* I, 241.

conventional ranges of prose, the shifts between *ὅδε* and *οὗτος* give trouble. They have given trouble to the latest commentator of Isaios. See Wyse on Isai. 4. 3. 3. *οὗτος* is prevalently 'the party of the other part,' but *ὅδε* may be 'our friend, the enemy,' 'our dearest foe,' and so = *οὗτος*. At all events, I must say to myself *μεταποίησον* and for dramatic read tragic." (*A. J. P.* xxix, 375.)

And finally:

"*Οὗτος* the dominant dem. comes early, *ἐκεῖνος* is not uncommon, but where is *ὅδε*, to which the grammars give the second place in the familiar group? But *ὅδε* is a very uncertain quantity (*A. J. P.* xxiii, 124). It belongs chiefly to dramatic literature, where it sometimes abounds to the overwhelming of *οὗτος* and *ἐκεῖνος*, which elsewhere override or efface it. In Eur. I. T., for instance, *ὅδε* outnumbers *οὗτος* four times, and there is a mere trace of *ἐκεῖνος*. The use, the proportion and the distribution of these demonstratives have not received the attention due." (*A. J. P.* xxvii, 327.)

These passages illustrate clearly the need and scope of such a study and are full of information and suggestion.

My first intention was to begin with a study of the use of these pronouns, but I saw at once that such a study would be futile without first collecting the statistics as to the distribution and proportion. It is, therefore, this first part of my investigation that is here presented.

It is needless for me to enumerate the usages of these pronouns at present. One matter, however, is so material to the paper that I must speak of it in detail, for I purpose to show that metrical considerations must have had some influence, within certain limits, in determining which pronoun should be used on certain occasions and in certain positions. It is not, of course, meant to imply that the great dramatic poets were bound by any narrow limits of metre to alter their thought, vary their words, misuse their grammar or do violence to their vocabulary, but, just as in all life, there is a curve of least resistance, which we all tend to follow, so in iambic metre of tragedy, there are certain positions,

which one or the other pronoun falls into the more easily, and which give a pleasanter cadence to the verse. Nor is it intended to imply that the poet was on any occasion forced to use any individual pronoun, but only to show that certain forms can fill certain positions and that in the one pronoun, *ὃδε*, more forms can fall into more positions than in the other, *οὗτος*. For example, *ὃδε*, *τόδε*, *τάδε* with or without elision, could be used in the sixth foot as a mere tag-piece of the verse, and consequently we find it very largely so used; while *οὗτος*,¹ which could be used only in the forms *τοῦτο* and *ταῦτα* and then only with elision of the final vowel in the last half of the foot, occurs only once (*Oed. Tyr.*, 332). As elision at the end of the verse is generally² denied for the other tragic poets it is to be presumed that this is an unique instance in tragedy. It is hardly to be doubted that the great divergence in use here is influenced more or less by metrical considerations. The absolutely determining reasons for the usage will be presented in a later paper.

In the initial foot of Ajax 119, *τοῦτου* is used. If we consider metrical grounds alone *τοῦδε* could not stand here. Yet Ajax is present now and is surely of no less importance to the speakers than before, and it would seem that the poet, if he had wished, might have used *τοῦδε* in referring to him in the sense of this man here, this man of whom we are speaking, with a look at him or a gesture of the hand, for it is generally acknowledged that *ὃδε* can be used when the speaker appropriates to himself something that is of the second or third person, something that is important.³ As for instance in 39 and 77, *ὃδε* is used of Ajax, though absent and in his tent and though he has been previously mentioned, because the lively and emotional concern of the speaker brings him within the sphere of the speaker. In fact, throughout this scene the absent Ajax is referred to by three different pronouns. It is to be noted that his name is mentioned in verse 4:

¹ Comedy was not so limited; the deictic *εἰ* allows *οὗτος*, etc. to stand in the 6th foot.

² Compare, however, Bates on Eurip. *Iph. Taur.* App. § 3 v. 98.

³ Kühner-Gerth, § 467. 4.

καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ σκηναῖς σε ναυτικαῖς ὁρῶ
Αἰάντος, ἔνθα τάξιν ἐσχάτην ἔχει

and that no change is made in the relative positions of Ajax and the speakers, Athene and Odysseus.

Yet immediately afterwards in line 6 we have,

ἴχνη τὰ κείνου νεοχάραχθ', ὅπως ἴδης

where we might have expected the anaphoric *τούτου* but for the fact of his absence. In line 20 Athene again refers to him with *κείνου* and in 28 with *ἐκείνῳ*, but in 39 she immediately changes and refers to him with *τοῦδε*. It will be observed that metrically neither *τούτου* nor *κείνου* could be used here. Jebb translates the *τοῦδε* 'yon man,' putting him off in the dim distance as if *κείνου* had been used and does not deem the passage of sufficient importance to warrant a note. Shall we call this *τοῦδε* emphatic? Shall we call it anaphoric? Is it used for emphasis, while *ταῦτα* in the same verse is anaphoric? Or shall we dare say metrical considerations, the emphatic position after the caesura, the beloved position (cf. p. 24) had some influence in determining the pronoun? Frankly, Ajax seems of no more importance, seems to need no more emphasis here than above, and this use of *ὅδε* is perhaps best explained by the wider use to be spoken of later.

In 77 again Athene uses *ὅδε* of Ajax, who, though still absent and in his tent, may be considered to be nearer in thought, but it is also worthy of note that it is used in the first half of the sixth foot, where neither *οὗτος* nor *κείνος* could be used.

In 80 Odysseus now takes him up and uses *τούτου* in the third foot, and it must again be noted that *τόνδε* could not be used here on metrical grounds. This *τούτου* might be explained as anaphoric, but we are justified in supposing that Odysseus is here labouring under deep emotion, as is shown by the entire passage. In this case, then, we should expect Ajax to be of the highest importance, to be well within the intellectual sphere of the speaker and the lively fear rather than fancy of Odysseus to be enough to justify *ὅδε* if it could have been used on metrical grounds.

Ajax is absent all the time and the conditions physically have undergone no change. We may explain these occurrences by emphatic, by anaphoric or what not, but the truth is, there seem to be many passages which these categorical terms do not satisfy.

Emphasis for instance is easily obtained by a little pressure and may lie in any of the pronouns. For example, Hom. *Iliad* II, 37,

ῥῳῖ ἡ γὰρ ὁ γ' αἰρήσειν Πριάμου πόλιν ἡματι κείνῳ

in which Leaf does not see anything worthy of a note. Sterrett, however, translates, "that very," and Seymour following Ameis-Hentze says, "emphatic," while Faesi makes no comment. What gives it its emphasis? Position at the end of the verse? τῳῖδε could have been used here as well.

Again in Eur. *I. T.* 62, we read:

παροῦσ' ἀπόντι, ταῦτα γὰρ δυναίμεθ' ἄν,

where Flagg correctly notes the ταῦτα as emphatic, but neither Wecklein nor Bates makes any comment. It is to be noted here that τῳῖδε could not be used on metrical grounds and that too in a play in which Professor Gildersleeve counts four times as many ὅδε's as οὗτος's. What makes ταῦτα emphatic? Its position in the third foot after the caesura? I should certainly say so.

Thus it will be seen that on occasion both ἐκεῖνος and οὗτος may assume the important role of emphasis, and that this term is too vague to satisfy us as the only condition of the use of this or that pronoun.

Anaphoric is again too vague a term, for all the pronouns demonstrative can be used anaphorically.

In the *Antigone* 189 we find:

ἦδ' ἐστὶν ἡ σώζουσα, καὶ ταύτης ἔπι, etc.

where ταύτης resumes ἦδ' or is anaphoric of ἦδ', but both are anaphoric of χθονός.

While in *Antigone* 296 we read

τοῦτο καὶ πόλεις
πορθεῖ, τόδ' ἄνδρας ἐξανίστησιν δόμων
τόδ' ἐκδιδάσκει καὶ παραλάσσει φρένας

where τόδ' resumes τοῦτο while both are anaphoric of νόμισμα preceding.

It would seem therefore that either pronoun is anaphoric on occasion. This state of affairs, when the two pronouns are used with reference to the same word, Kühner-Gerth (§ 467. 4) explain by the relation of emphasis for ὅδε, anaphora for οὗτος. For convenience the passage is quoted in full: "Auch können beide Pronomen: ὅδε und οὗτος auf einen und denselben Gegenstand hindeutend, ὅδε denselben emphatisch vergegenwärtigend, οὗτος auf denselben bloss hinweisend: ὅδε . . . οὗτος verhalten sich gleichsam wie Arsis und Thesis, οὗτος . . . ὅδε wie Thesis und Arsis," quoting the two examples given above and several others. We might add Eur. Med. 1046 as an example of the first class.¹

It is very doubtful whether this relation always holds good, for, as said above, emphasis is a subtle thing and can be elicited with very little pressure. "Ὅδε which "gets to itself the connotation of the important first person," by virtue of this connotation, becomes emphatic, but, it seems to me, that οὗτος, notwithstanding the "opposition" which "ὅδε sets up to it" also is tyrant enough to seize the throne of emphasis when need be and by its position in the verse, by its use with the stronger clause, gets for itself as much emphasis as ὅδε and at times more.

In the Antigone 296, for example, I feel τοῦτο as stronger than τόδε by its position at the head of the sentence, by its position after the caesura and by its association with the stronger and larger element πόλεις | πορθεῖ, each word of which clause is more

¹ Cf. also Aesch. Ag. 1434, 1442 and 1447, where ὅδε is used of the dead Agamemnon with 1438 where οὗτος is used of the same person; there seems to be no question of emphasis. It is to be observed that in the first examples οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος could not be used and in 1438 ὅδε could not be used on metrical grounds.

or less emphatic, a point that can not, however, be pressed, as they can hardly occupy other positions.

In *Antigone* 64

ἔπειτα δ' οὐνεκ' ὀρχόμεσθ' ἐκ κρείσσόνων
καὶ ταῦτ' ἀκούειν κᾶτι τῶνδ' ἀλγίονα¹

it would be absurd, if not well nigh impossible to throw greater emphasis on τῶνδ' than on ταῦτ. It may be observed that ταῦτ' here falls into the more important, more emphatic foot, as does also ἦδ' in 189, by virtue of which position we may say it receives the greater emphasis here.

In *Antigone* 673

αὕτη πόλεις ὄλλυσιν, ἦδ' ἀναστάτους
οἴκους τίθησιν, ἦδε κτλ.

I should again for similar reasons say αὕτη is the more emphatic pronoun. This view Jebb seems to take by his translation, although he makes no comment in his notes. He translates thus: "This it is that ruins cities; this makes homes desolate," the expansion by 'it is that' pointing the emphasis on 'this.'

Now it is just to such instances as these, when either pronoun may presumably be used, that attention is especially called. There is a borderline of usage, so to speak, that brings into play the metrical side, where the poet for metrical reasons may choose the pronoun that best suits his purpose. Furthermore it seems to me that ὅδε has a much wider range and meaning than is sometimes assigned to it. Like the present tense of the verb, it belongs pre-eminently to the present sphere, to the speaker and his time, but also, as in the case of the present tense, no hard and fast canon of limitation can be made. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as pure present time, for the world moves so fast that the

¹ Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 436 and 1329, where we could hardly insist upon *emphasis*.

present is ever a succession of moving perpendicular lines and we can rarely connect the thought, word and act into a simultaneous unit, so as to have a pure present. The result is that we speak too soon, and so make the act itself future or we speak too late and so make the act past. Thus it is with ὅδε. Its specific, pure use is a deictic pronoun of the speaker in the present time, which, however, is not to be limited to the immediate present. This element of the speaker, of the first person, is what makes it specifically the pronoun of tragedy, in which there is so much of deep personal moment to the speaker. But here, in its wider sense, it could, as we saw in the case of the present tense, partake of the future or of the past, or in other words, while it generally refers to what is to come, it may also refer to what is past. There is, therefore, in the use of this pronoun a borderline at which it could share the nature of οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος, so that the poet could choose this pronoun whenever occasion demanded, within certain limits, within, so to speak, the neutral ground on either side of the pure, actual present of the speaker. This freedom of usage, together with the fact that forms of ὅδε alone can stand in certain places in the tragic trimeter, may help to account for the large use of ὅδε in tragedy. The advantage of ὅδε in the matter of trochaic forms over οὗτος is four to one, since ὅδε shows seventeen forms that can fill certain places, while οὗτος shows a bare four. This, it may be noted, is about the proportion found in Euripides's *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, as counted by Professor Gildersleeve, and in the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, as counted by myself. In Sophocles, however, such a proportion does not exist except in the *Oedipus at Colonos*.

With this brief introduction, I present the following tables of occurrences, which are self-explanatory.

	Ajax.	Antigone.	Electra.	Oed. Tyr.	Trachin.	Philoct.	Oed. Col.	Totals.
<i>ὅδε</i> as a subst.....	52	79	86	81	72	72	111	553
“ preceding with article....	16	7	14	15	13	14	22	101
“ “ without article.	35	28	34	44	28	32	70	271
“ following with article.....	6	6	2	6	5	19	4	38
“ “ without article.	20	8	16	21	16	27	45	153
“ with interrog. rel. &c.....	2	1	1	1	1	3	2	11
“ interjected.....	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	4
Totals.....	151	130	155	168	135	157	255	1121
<i>οὗτος</i> as a subst.....	54	71	85	81	51	110	70	522
“ preceding with article...	6	5	4	7	3	2	1	28
“ “ without article.	3	2	4	4	3	2	3	21
“ following with article...	2	5	1	11	2	5	1	27
“ “ without article.	1	1	1	2	0	0	2	7
“ with interrog. ul. &c....	1	4	0	0	1	1	5	12
“ interjected.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
“ in address.....	3	0	0	2	1	0	1	7
Totals.....	70	88	95	107	61	120	85	626
<i>ἐκεῖνος</i> as subst.....	27	14	34	25	33	34	25	192
“ preceding with article...	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	4
“ “ without article.	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	7
“ following with article...	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	5
“ “ without article.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
“ with interrog. ul. &c....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
“ interjected.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Totals.....	33	16	37	28	34	36	27	211

The percentage of occurrence of these pronouns is as follows, two sets being given, one for *ὅδε* and *οὗτος* and the other for *ὅδε*, *οὗτος* and *ἐκεῖνος*.

TOTAL PERCENTAGES.

ὅδε	64 +	οὗτος	35 +	
ὅδε	56 +	οὗτος	31 +	ἐκεῖνος 10 +

I should like to call especial attention to the fact that in the substantival use, ὅδε exceeds οὗτος by only 31 occurrences or a percentage of 51 to 49. If, however, we subtract the occurrences of ὅδε (110) in the sixth foot and of οὗτος (1) in the same foot whence οὗτος is practically excluded by metrical considerations, we find οὗτος exceeds ὅδε by 80 occurrences, or a percentage of 54 to 46. It is therefore, only in combination with a substantive, adjective or participle that ὅδε makes its strong headway against οὗτος.

It is to be noted that when ὅδε precedes its substantive accompanied by the article, the numbers are 101, while with the article omitted, the numbers are 38, and for οὗτος under the same conditions the numbers are 28 to 27. This relation is made easy, if not somewhat caused by the readiness with which ὅδε falls into certain feet and especially in such cadences as τοῦδε τοῦ πόνου, τόνδε τὸν θεόν, τῇδε θῆμέρα κτλ. Οὗτος on the other hand gives no such cadences except in the trochaic forms, and is, with exceedingly few exceptions, separated from its substantive.

The following are the percentages for the individual plays, given as above, first for ὅδε and οὗτος and then for ὅδε, οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος.

	ὅδε	οὗτος		ὅδε	οὗτος	ἐκεῖνος
Ajax	68 +	31 +	}	59 +	27 +	11 +
Antigone	59 +	40 +		55 +	37 +	7 +
Electra	62	38		54 +	33 +	12 +
Oed. Tyr.	61 +	38 +		55 +	35 +	9 +
Trachin.	68 +	31 +		58 +	26 +	14 +
Philoctetes	56 +	43 +		50 +	38 +	11 +
Oed. Col.	75 +	24 +		70 +	22 +	7 +

It will be noted that except in the *Oedipus Coloneus* the diver-

gence is nowhere so great as, for instance in the *Iphigenia Taurica*, where Professor Gildersleeve says ὄδε occurs four times as often as οὔτος. A rapid count of the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus gives similar results.

It is worth while and may be found of interest to give the occurrences of these pronouns in the several feet of the iambic trimeter, in order that it may be seen at a glance how these forms are distributed and from what feet or parts of feet certain forms are excluded.

In most of the feet two types are found, with or without elision, all of which are carefully noted. It will be seen that in certain positions elided forms only can be used, while in others elided forms are of such frequent occurrence that we must feel the vast advantage that ὄδε has over οὔτος under such circumstances.

A table of percentages for all the pronouns in the different feet is first given with the types and discussion of each following. This table is made up by taking the percentage of the occurrences of each pronoun in each play compared with itself, not the percentage of the total occurrences, *i. e.* 11.20 denotes the percentage of ὄδε's in the *Antigone* that fill the first foot.

AJAX. ANTIG. ELECT. OED. TYR. TRACH. PHIL. OED. COL.

ὄδε

1	11.20	17.4	16.	14.6	10.6	8.4	16.3
2	12.	12.8	10.9	9.5	12.5	13.	9.8
3	50.4	41.3	37.2	38.1	42.3	36.6	45.1
4	13.6	12.8	10.9	15.2	22.1	16.8	10.7
5	4.	1.8	10.2	12.	2.9	9.1	9.3
6	8.8	13.8	14.6	10.1	10.6	16.	8.8

οὔτος

1	38.	39.	28.2	24.2	42.4	33.	23.7
2	7.9	9.8	14.1	15.1	6.8	12.8	18.4
3	44.4	36.6	40.	40.4	32.5	36.5	36.8
4	7.9	7.3	9.4	10.1	8.5	7.3	9.2
5	1.6	7.3	8.2	10.1	10.1	9.2	12.8
6	0	0	0	1.	0.	0	0

AJAX. ANTIG. ELECT. OED. TYR. TRACH. PHIL. OED. COL.

ἑκεῖνος

1	38.5	13.3	21.9	11.1	37.4	26.9	36.4
2	38.5	33.3	40.6	37.3	28.1	15.4	18.2
3	7.7	26.7	9.4	29.6	12.5	30.8	27.3
4	3.8	0	9.4	11.1	6.3	0	4.5
5	11.5	26.7	18.8	11.1	18.8	26.9	13.6

In the first we have for ὅδε the following types:

1. Ajax 28. τήνδ' οὖν ἐκείνῳ πᾶς τις αἰτίαν νέμει
2. Ajax 347. τὰ τοῦδε πράγη, καὐτὸς ὡς ἔχων κυρεῖ

In the first type, it is to be observed, any form of ὅδε may occur, while in the second only the oblique cases with a long penult may occur. From this and from the fact that this second type gives the first part of the second foot, we might expect that ὅδε would here exceed οὗτος. This, however, is not so. Οὗτος far exceeds in this foot. This seems to be due largely to the fact that here any form of οὗτος may be used, which has the further advantage over ὅδε in that its oblique cases may fill the whole foot, while ὅδε can do this only when the following word begins with a double consonant or with two consonants. The same reasons hold good for ἐκεῖνος, which shows a large excess here over all other feet save the second. This fact will be noticed later.

We find the distribution of ὅδε in this foot as follows:

- Ajax (1). 28 (ε); 789 (ε); 1025 (ε); 1288 (ε); 1355 (ε). 5.
 “ (2). 347; 652; 962 (ε); 984; 1033; 1061 (ε); 1090;
 1246. 8.
 Antigone (1). 19 (ε); 298 (ε); 384 (ε); 385 (ε); 386 (ε);
 740 (ε); 751 (ε); 1093 (ε); 1219 (ε);
 1301 (ε). 10.
 “ (2). 212; 293; 422 (ε); 567; 646 (ε); 699; 732;
 763 (ε); 927 (ε). 9.

Electra (1).	293 (€); 627 (€); 662 (€); 884 (€); 982 (€); 1105 (€); 1118 (€); 1178 (€); 1353 (€); 1480 (€).	10.
“ (2).	371; 373; 540; 570; 784 (€); 787 (€); 790 (€); 798 (€); 956 (€); 963; 1122; 1356.	12.
Oed. Tyr. (1).	237 (€); 242 (€); 274 (€); 323 (€); 438 (€); 632 (€); 1130 (€); 1145 (€); 1280 (€).	
“ “ (2).	10; 32; 91; 98 (€); 104; 110 (€); 136; 235; 383; 603 (€); 755; 815; 1010; 1120.	14.
Trach. (1).	869 (€); 1073 (€); 1162 (€); 1201 (€).	4.
“ (2).	17; 173; 344; 366; 447; 489 (€); 614 (€).	7.
Phil. (1).	29 (€); 261 (€); 575 (€); 764 (€); 966 (€); 985 (€); 1046 (€); 1072 (€).	8.
“ (2).	71; 1335; 1351.	3.
Oed. Col. (1).	59 (€); 640 (€); 968 (€); 1098 (€); 1117 (€); 1329 (€); 1361 (€); 1368 (€); 1412 (€); 1547 (€); 1668 (€).	11.
“ “ (2).	61; 264; 331; 355 (€); 445; 478; 480; 554 (€); 630 (€); 635; 637; 727; 739; 898; 915; 1287; 1290 (€); 1306 (€); 1367; 1405 (€); 1428 (€); 1434; 1444; 1618.	24.

The two types of οὔτος in the first foot and the distribution are as follows:

Ajax 71. οὔτος, σὲ τὸν τὰς αἰχμαλωτίδας χέρας

Ajax 89. ὦ οὔτος, Αἴας, δεύτερόν σε προσκαλῶ

Attention is called to the fact that in the first type, the form τούτοις of the dat. plur. (*Oed. Col.* 908) gives the required short syllable of the first half of the second foot, which thus gives οὔτος an additional advantage over ὅδε in this foot.

The distribution is as follows:

Ajax (1).	71; 119; 497; 745 (€); 864 (€); 1012; 1032; 1047; 1060; 1082; 1138 (€); 1235 (€); 1265; 1372; 1383.	15.
-----------	---	-----

- Ajax. (2). 89; 270 (€); 971 (€); 1023; 1066; 1115;
1280 (€); 1313 (€); 1346 (€). 9.
- Antigone (1). 16 (€); 203; 402; 404; 458; 480; 483; 508;
641; 673; 709; 750; 990; 1023 (€); 1052;
1074; 1170; 1244 (€). 18.
- “ (2). 64 (€); 93; 211 (€); 274 (€); 305 (€);
322 (€); 457; 485 (€) 550 (€); 668 (€);
1015; 1077 (€); 1102 (€); 1167. 14.
- Electra (1). 6; 274; 280; 287; 361; 401 (€); 437; 559;
655 (€); 692; 981; 1043; 1474. 13.
- “ (2). 351; 383; 385; 397; 546 (€); 614; 820;
1046 (€); 1346; 1366; 1471 (€). 11.
- Oed. Tyr. (1). 69; 106; 226; 385; 442; 532; 547 (€);
548 (€); 605 (€); 814; 847 (€); 954;
1013 (€); 1070; 1078; 1121; 1504. 17.
- “ “ (2). 37 (€); 269; 426; 429; 958; 1041; 1493. 7.
- Trachin. (1). 244; 299; 338; 351; 353; 402; 408 (€); 443;
476; 550 (€); 578 (€); 676 (€); 1174 (€);
1222; 1256. 15.
- “ (2), 80; 148 (€); 167 (€); 371; 479; 495 (€);
679 (€); 898 (€); 1058; 1235 (€). 10.
- Philoct. (1). 66; 128; 284; 301; 307; 348 (€); 406 (€);
435; 436 (€); 458; 465 (€); 890; 922;
1022; 1044; 1059; 1073; 1078; 1331;
1343 (€); 1355 (€); 1437. 22.
- “ (2). 67; 117; 292 (€); 380 (€); 442; 565; 567 (€);
595 (€); 614 (€); 648 (€); 654; 921 (€);
988; 1325 (€); 1382. 15.
- Oed. Col. (1). 68; 88; 382 (€); 404; 575 (€); 908; 1522;
1586 (€). 8.
- “ “ (2). 214 (€); 455; 763; 951 (€); 956; 1252;
1289 (€); 1344; 1393 (€); 1627. 10.

Ἐκεῖνος presents three possible types in this foot according to whether the long or short form is used, *e. g.*

1. { Ajax 20. κείνον γὰρ οὐδὲν ἄλλον, ἰχνεύω πάλαι
 { Ajax 795. ἐκείνον εἵργειν Τεῦκρος ἐξεφίεται
2. Electra 1357. ἡ κείνον οὗτος ὅν ποτ' ἐκ πολλῶν ἐγώ

Here we notice that the trisyllabic forms fill the whole of the first foot and give the required short syllable in the first half of the second foot, which latter fact is likewise true of the trochaic forms in the third example. This type, however, is very rare.

The distribution is as follows:

Ajax (1).	20; 275; 285; 454; 513; 567; 769; 795; 1035; 1039.	10.
Antigone (1).	468; 525.	2.
Electra (1).	342; 344; 664; 681; 703; 720.	6.
“ (2).	1351.	1.
Oed Tyr. (1).	141; 923; 1171.	3.
Trachin. (1).	29; 85; 253; 281; 485; 579; 605; 777.	8.
“ (2).	581; 608; 759.	3.
Philoct. (1).	37; 310; 359; 423; 424; 570; 772.	7.
Oed. Col. (1).	402; 589; 661; 910; 986; 1373; 1584.	7.
“ “ (2).	1197.	1.

In the second foot there are likewise two types for ὄδε and ἐκείνος, but there is only one for οὗτος.

Ὅδε may fall into either half of this foot, *e. g.*

- Ajax 447. κεί μὴ τόδ' ὄμμα καὶ φρένες διάστροφοι
 Ajax 78. ἐχθρός γε τῷδε τάνδρ' καὶ τὰ νῦν ἔτι

These are distributed as follows:

Ajax (1).	447 (€); 658 (€); 898 (€); 909 (€); 950 (€); 1268 (€); 1308 (€); 1401 (€).	8.
“ (2).	78; 289 (€); 568; 828; 904 (€); 969 (€); 1385.	7.
Antigone (1).	80 (€); 279 (€); 297 (€); 415 (€); 464 (€); 735 (€); 1107 (€); 1172 (€); 1295 (€); 1316 (€).	10.
“ (2).	195; 401; 518; 1304.	4.

Electra (1).	296; (€); 311 (€); 443 (€); 460 (€); 470 (€); 882 (€); 908 (€); 1020 (€); 1205 (€); 1372 (€).	10.
“ (2).	328; 527 (€); 611; 979; 1133.	5.
Oed. Tyr. (1).	279 (€); 286 (€); 531 (€); 571 (€); 754 (€); 1000 (€); 1053 (€); 1128 (€); 1100 (€); 1369 (€);	10.
“ “ (2).	143 (€); 392 (€); 519; 927; 1318 (€).	5.
Trachin. (1).	58 (€); 187 (€); 346 (€); 391 (€); 622 (€); 912 (€); 1050 (€); 1238 (€).	8.
“ (2).	370; 430; 471; 580 (€); 604.	5.
Philoct. (1).	6 (€); 288 (€); 312 (€); 333 (€); 628 (€); 650 (€); 889 (€); 893 (€); 910 (€); 938 (€); 1256 (€); 1258 (€); 1353 (€).	13.
“ (2).	1; 68; 887; 1036.	4.
Oed. Col. (1).	16 (€); 69 (€); 101 (€); 321 (€); 499 (€); 630 (€); 723 (€); 851 (€); 894 (€); 941 (€); 981 (€); 1249 (€); 1307 (€).	13.
“ “ (2).	65; 649; 735; 815; 1391; 1424 (€); 1546; 1547.	8.

Attention is called to the great number of elisions, which must occur in the first type unless the word of the third foot begins with two consonants or a double consonant. This never occurs. Elision occurs nine times in the second type. The numerous forms that *ὄδε* has which can be elided, make it easy for this pronoun to fall into either half of this foot, and thus have a great advantage that *οὗτος*.

There is only one type of *οὗτος* possible in this foot, an example of which follows.

Ajax 124. *οὐδὲν τὸ τοῦτου μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦμὸν σκοπῶν.*

We find it thus distributed.

Ajax (1).	124; 277; 470; 1282; 1343.	5.
Antigone (1).	7 (€); 426; 504; 509; 693; 1014; 1088; 1334.	8.

Electra (1).	271; 348; 355; 375; 400; 426; 766; 928; 993; 1351; 1371; 1412.	12.
Oed. Tyr. (1).	126 (€); 252; 291; 440 (€); 568; 584; 672; 831; 935; 947; 1033 (€); 1044; 1139; 1140; 1181.	15.
Trachin. (1).	246; 419; 449 (€); 1248.	4.
Philoct. (1).	74; 77; 410; 430; 441; 522 (€); 591; 603 (€); 606; 758; 763; 765; 1319; 1336.	14.
Oed. Col. (1).	46; 291; 366; 388; 471; 482; 640; 775; 871; 893; 986; 1034; 1627; 1638 (€).	14.

It is to be noted that, although *οὗτος* is excluded from the first half of this foot, it does not lag behind *ὅδε* even here and in a percentage of the number of times each occurs in all the plays *οὗτος* yields 80 per cent. and *ὅδε* 77.

Owing to its double forms *ἐκεῖνος* in this foot may also show two types.

Ajax 28. τήνδ' οὖν ἐκείνω πᾶς τις αἰτίαν νέμει.

Ajax 6. ἔχνη τὰ κείνου νεοχάραχθ', ὅπως ἴδης.

The distribution of these is as follows:

Ajax (1).	28; 271; 755; 798; 1032; 1039; 1108; 1303.	8.
" 6;	437.	2.
Antigone (1).	170; 287; 384; 514; 570.	5.
Electra (1).	269; 278; 389; 539; 543; 784; 1178; 1218.	8.
Oed. Tyr. (1).	579; 930; 959; 991; 1254; 1440; 1454.	7.
" " (2).	263; 1240; 1253.	3.
Trachin. (1).	198; 244; 287; 342; 488; 603; 942.	7.
" (2).	544; 1091.	2.
Philoct. (1).	106; 115; 268; 413; 633; 770.	6.
" (2).	376.	1.
Oed. Col. (1).	337; 344; 1195.	3.
" " (2).	302, 392.	2.

In proportion to its numbers, *ἐκεῖνος* makes a goodly showing

in this foot, due, doubtless, to the facts mentioned above. The percentage of its occurrences in this foot ranges from 18 to 40, which is a little larger than its percentage in the first foot, which ranges from 11 to 38.

The third foot allows the pronouns to give each two types, yet in such a way that $\delta\delta\epsilon$ has largely the advantage here.

The two types of $\delta\delta\epsilon$ are seen in the following

Ajax 13. *σπουδὴν ἔθου τήνδ', ὡς παρ' εἰδυίας μάθης*

Ajax 11. *καί σ' οὐδὲν εἴσω τῆσδε παπταίνειν πύλης*

The first type is comparatively rare, never exceeding 13 occurrences in any play and generally ranging from 5 to 7. It is always found with elision, and thus makes quasi-caesura in the third foot, which probably accounts for its rareness. Without elision, it could occur only when the first half of the fourth foot shows two consonants or a double consonant. As in this case it would fill the foot and so block caesura entirely therefrom, this is never found with $\delta\delta\epsilon$ and rarely with *οὗτος* or *ἐκεῖνος*.

The distribution in this foot is as follows:

- Ajax (1). 13 (€); 822 (€); 1038 (€); 1058 (€); 1126 (€);
1140 (€); 1250 (€). 7.
- “ (2). 11; 21; 24 (€); 39; 42 (€); 46; 61 (€); 65; 93; 98
(€); 113; 281 (€); 335; 434 (€); 446 (€);
484; 537 (€); 546; 553 (€); 566 (€);
583 (€); 740 (€); 747; 756; 778; 785 (€);
850 (€); 862; 895; 916; 922; 950; 976
(€); 1029 (€); 1032; 1045; 1047; 1057;
1089; 1100; 1103; 1108; 1169; 1174;
1179 (€); 1184; 1310 (€); 1391 (€); 1321
(€); 1326; 1346 (€); 1362; 1371; 1378;
1389 (€); 1394 (€). 56.
- Antigone (1). 203 (€); 395 (€); 398 (€); 725 (€); 769 (€);
925 (€). 6.
- “ (2). 43; 192; 198; 209; 237 (€); 283; 309; 400
(€); 414 (€); 449 (€); 465; 468; 485;

- 490; 508; 510; 549; 561; 566 (€); 570;
 574; 575; 579; 654; 674; 733 (€); 758
 (€); 907 (€); 994 (€); 1012 (€); 1034;
 1058 (€); 1076; 1162; 1279 (a dactyl);
 1282; 1312; 1313 (€); 1335. 39.
- Electra (1). 40 (€); 264 (€); 383 (€); 388 (€); 1488 (€). 5.
 “ (2). 65; 71 (€); 274; 303; 353; 379; 387; 412; 427;
 440; 451 (€); 468; 471; 538; 580; 608;
 616; 635 (€); 640; 643; 663 (€); 665;
 783 (€); 784; 802; 886; 888 (€); 912 (€);
 981; 1004 (€); 1189 (€); 1192; 1193;
 1213; 1222; 1228; 1302 (€); 1314 (€);
 1331; 1334; 1336; 1381; 1421; 1461;
 1497; 1505. 46.
- Oed. Tyr. (1). 101 (€); 251 (€); 264 (€); 282 (€); 353 (€);
 443 (€); 527 (€); 574 (€); 647 (€); 700
 (€); 735 (€); 1251 (€); 1464 (€). 13.
- “ “ (2). 51 (€); 54; 72; 102; 104 (€); 113; [116];¹
 134; 149; 307; 323 (€); 340 (€); 373 (€);
 409; 418; 431 (€); 534; 601; 648; 670
 (€); 671 (€); 762 (€); 764; 798; 801 (€);
 811; 829 (€); 920; 928; 952; 1002; 1015;
 1018; 1043; 1075 (€); 1113; 1136; 1154
 (€); 1156 (€); 1164; 1173; 1223 (€);
 1228; 1436 (€); 1465 (€); 1481; 1507. 47.
- Trachin. (1). 336 (€); 363 (€); 477 (€); 487 (€); 1107 (€). 5.
 “ (2). 20; 36 (€); 72; 77; 87; 91 (€); 204; 240 (€);
 260; 274; 283; 294; 295; 305; 309; 312;
 339 (€); 343; 409; 411; 483 (€); 545 (€);
 584 (€); 602; 612; 615 (€); 620; 718;
 737; 774; 804 (€); 1044; 1057; 1109;
 1113; 1175; 1182 (€); 1256. 38.

¹This is not counted. I suggested in a private letter to a friend the possibility of reading *τὸδὲ* here sometime ago and I believe the suggestion receives considerable weight from the large use of *δδὲ* in this part of the foot.

- Philoct. (1). 426 (€); 572 (€); 590 (€); 633 (€); 788 (€);
800 (€); 820 (€); 1038 (€); 1362 (€);
1412 (€); 1423 (€); 1426 (€). 12.
- “ (2). 23 (€); 40; 61 (€); 87; 220; 244; 286 (€);
319; 418; 474; 542; 573; 598 (€);
612; 613 (€); 616; 652 (€); 669 (€); 877;
899; 954 (€); 956 (τοισιδ’); 964; 1005;
1017 (€); 1057 (€); 1232 (dactyl); 1262;
1329; 1331; 1334; 1336 (€); 1375; 1377;
1378; 1437 (€). 36.
- Oed. Col. (1). 98 (€); 507 (€); 549 (€); 728 (€); 783 (€);
813 (€); 830 (€); 883 (€); 1176 (€); 1353
(€); 1637 (€). 11.
- “ “ (2). 19 (€); 33; 45 (€); 57; 79; 85; 94; 114 (€);
255; 288 (€); 296; 418 (€); 423; 436 (€);
451; 459; 462 (€); 463 (€); 466; 484 (€);
493; 508; 586; 605; 641; 758; 773; 780
(€); 786 (€); 816; 821; 826; 857; 860
(€); 862; 865; 871; 875; 892 (€); 903;
909; 934; 939; 949 (€); 950 (€); 988 (€);
1007; 1010; 1013; 1024 (€); 1100 (€);
1107 (€); 1114; 1117; 1121; 1125 (€);
1128; 1140; 1146; 1163 (€); 1166 (€);
1171 (€); 1182; 1275 (€); 1326; 1332 (€);
1348; 1362 (€); 1365; 1371; 1379; 1384;
1404; 1460; 1472 (€); 1476; 1506 (€);
1509; 1519; 1528 (€); 1533 (€); 1601 (€);
1612 (€); 1633; 1634 (€); 1641. 86.

To be especially noticed are the rareness of the first type and the frequency of elision in the second. This flexibility in the forms of *ῥδε* allows its to stand in a number of instances in which *οὔτος* cannot possibly be used and so it possesses again notable advantages over *οὔτος*. Attention may also be called here to the fact that *ῥδε* occurs 59 times in the first half of this foot and 366 times in the second half; *οὔτος* occurs 24 times in the first

half and 185 times in the second; and *ἐκείνος* 13 times in the first half and 22 in the second. This will indicate the great prominence of the second half of the foot, which is naturally a very important place, coming, as it does, immediately after the caesura, and it is natural that the more emphatic pronoun should seek this position for itself.

This is by far the most interesting situation of them all, for it is here that the greatest struggle for supremacy takes place between *ὅδε* and *οὗτος*. As is evident, the former has very decided advantages in the contest, since so many more of its forms can occur in the second half of the foot.

The most usual and most beloved type is well seen in the two following verses from the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus:

Ag. 1. θεοὺς μὲν αἰτῶ τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγὴν πόνων

and

Ag. 18. κλάω τότ' οἴκου τοῦδε συμφορὰν στένων.

The *ὅδε* forms may fill this position easily whether they precede or follow their substantive, whether their substantive is articular or not, which is a good deal more difficult for the oblique cases of *οὗτος* that show two long syllables. I should like to call attention to the fact that the insertion of a quadrisyllable word with elision of the final vowel of the *ὅδε* between this foot and the iambic word of the last foot is of very frequent occurrence and seems to be especially desired in this position; or it may be that the ease with which long words slipped into this interval is a cause of the frequent occurrence. Whatever may be the cause, the fact remains, and the cadence is certainly very pleasing to the ear.

This type is also found in the iambographs and the comedians, where, however, *οὗτος* far outruns *ὅδε*. In comedy, this is due no doubt, partly to the different sphere, partly to the fact that the comic trimeter is not bound by the strict laws of short and long in the even feet, which hamper the tragic trimeter in this respect. Perhaps, too, the deictic *ι* added to *οὗτος* brought it

much nearer to the more emphatic *ὅδε*, which was thus rendered less necessary for comedy, even though, as Professor Gildersleeve says, 'comedy comes nearer to real life and we should expect it to be more exact.' Compare, for instance, the two following lines from Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 200-201:

πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, τί γὰρ τὰδ' ἐστὶν; εἰπέ μοι.
ἀστρονομία μὲν αὐτηί. τουτὶ δὲ τί;

where Starkie comments on *τάδε* with seeming correctness, but has no word for the following *αὐτηί* or *τουτί*.

It will be thus seen, as Professor Gildersleeve again observes, that *ὅδε* is preëminently the pronoun of tragedy.

Οὔτος also makes a goodly showing in this foot, and especially is this true when we consider the paltry number of forms it can offer.

There are two types as follows:

1. Ajax 318. ἄλλ', ὦ φίλοι, τούτων γὰρ οὔνεκ' ἐστάλην
2. Ajax 80. ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀρκεῖ τοῦτον ἐν δόμοις μένειν.

The distribution of *οὔτος* is seen in the following.

Ajax (1).	328; 684 (τούτοισιν).	2.
"	80; 116; 378 (ε); 392 (ε); 411; 505; 513 (ε); 524; 552; 556; 670; 769 (ε); 786; 852; 970; 1034 (ε); 1036; 1087; 1141; 1255 (ε); 1274; 1282; 1288; 1308; 1336; 1395.	26.
Antigone (1).	None.	0.
"	(2). 33; 35; 61; 72; 96; 165; 183; 188; 216; 218 (ε); 221; 273; 275; 289; 321; 327; 446; 498 (ε); 504; 515; 538; 658 (ε); 665; 722; 762; 908; 914 (ε); 1042; 1049; 1336.	30.
Electra (1).	431; 450; 605 (ε); 703 (τούτοισι); 1190; (ε); 1343 (τούτοισιν); 1370; 1377 (τούτοισιν)	8.
"	(2). 59 (ε); 73; 256 (ε); 301; 438; 447; 448; 578	

	(€); 645; 680; 904 (€); 915; 933; 938 (€); 988; 1030; 1033; 1041; 1044 (€); 1049; 1115 (€); 1149 (€); 1173 (€); 1186; 1206; 1431.	26.
Oed. Tyr. (1).	553 (€); 731 (€); 739 (€); 1138 (€).	4.
“ “ (2).	138 (€); 235; 236; 317; 349 (€); 355; 368 (€); 372 (€); 378; 451; 523; 537 (€); 562; 603; 728 (€); 732; 737 (€); 786 (€); 794; 828; 834 (€); 849; 973; 984 (€); 1005 (€); 1013; 1038 (€); 1045; 1058 (€); 1061 (€); 1067; 1120; 1144; 1166 (€); 1442; 1452.	36.
Trachin. (1).	685 (€); 1164 (τούτοις).	2.
“ (2).	71 (€); 189; 254; 285; 358; 403 (€); 408; 422 (€); 424; 458; 575; 600; 917 (€); 1077; 1211; 1216; 1227.	17.
Philoct. (1).	628 (€); 892 (τούτοιςιν); 1304 (€).	3.
“ (2).	38; 110; 112; 113; 231; 232; 233; 238 (€); 294 (€); 411 (€); 413 (€); 414; 419; 444; 451; 477 (€); 658; 667; 772; 779; 803 (€); 869 (€); 872 (€); 906 (€); 913 (€); 987; 990 (€); 1056; 1073; 1248; 1339; 1345; 1397 (€); 1399; 1421 (€); 1433 (€); 1440.	37.
Oed. Col. (1).	62 (€); 263 (€); 771 (€); 787 (€); 848.	5.
“ “ (2).	25; 295; 302; 403; 409; 420 (€); 440; 452 (€); 504; 597; 629; 721; 797; 809; 817 (€); 838 (€); 861; 971 (€); 1168; 1431; 1443; 1474; 1616 (€).	23.

Attention is called to the rarity of the first type, which by filling the entire foot, would do away with the caesura entirely. Consequently, a majority of the instances are with elision, which admits quasi-caesura or with the long form *τούτοιςιν* which, although it fills the whole foot, furnishes the required short for the first half of the fourth foot. The excess of *δδε*'s in the first

half of this foot is doubtless due largely to the ease with which the final ϵ can be elided in so many of its forms; thus it does not entirely shut off the possibility of slight pause. Only in the *Electra* do we find an excess of οὗτος's in this part of the foot, the numbers being for ὅδε 5, οὗτος 8, of which latter two forms suffer elision and three yield the long form *τούτοισιν*.

Ἐκεῖνος likewise offers two types here:

1. *Antigone* 408. πρὸς σοῦ τὰ δεῖν' ἐκεῖν' ἐπειπηλημένα.
2. *Ajax* 783. οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ κείνος, εἰ Κάλχας σοφός,

which are distributed as follows:

<i>Ajax</i> (1).	None.	0.
" (2).	793; 991.	2.
<i>Antigone</i> (1).	408; 1039.	2.
" (2).	1025; 1043.	2.
<i>Electra</i> (1).	519; 568 (κείνης); 882.	3.
" (2).	None.	0.
<i>Oed. Tyr.</i> (1).	139; 599 (ε); 785; 855; 1054; 1168.	6.
" " (2).	718; 1145.	2.
<i>Trachin.</i> (1).	None.	0.
" (2).	38; 353; 577; 719.	4.
<i>Philoct.</i> (1).	642 (κακείνοισι).	1.
" (2).	123; 261; 360; 385; 415; 431; 622.	7.
<i>Oed. Col.</i> (1).	87.	1.
" " (2).	585; 1191; 1206; 1343; 1656.	5.

It will be noted that ἐκεῖνος makes very little headway in this foot, the second half being nearly double the first.

In the fourth foot two types are again found for ὅδε and ἐκεῖνος, while only one is possible for οὗτος.

Ὅδε gives the following types:

1. *Ajax* 1058. ἡμεῖς μὲν ἂν τήνδ' ἦν ὅδ' εἵληφεν τύχην.
2. *Ajax* 114. σὺ δ' οὖν ἐπειδὴ τέρψις ἦδε σοι τὸ δρᾶν.

The distribution of these is seen in the following:

Ajax (1).	1058 (€); 1101 (€); 1280 (€).	3.
“ (2).	114; 559; 578 (€); 738; 781(€); 798; 834; 990; 1080; 1128; 1168; 1176; 1332; 1376 (€).	14.
Antigone (1).	39 (€); 229 (€).	2.
“ (2).	64 (€); 119 (€); 306; 482; 534; 536 (€); 576; 666; 673 (€); 736; 889; 1111.	12.
Electra (1).	553 (€); 604 (€); 926.	3.
“ (2).	68; 83 (€); 389; 419 (€); 441 (€); 605; 612; 644; 674 (€); 818; 1179; 1203.	12.
Oed. Tyr. (1).	108 (€); 125 (€); 148 (€); 377 (€); 613 (€); 729 (€); 819 (€); 1065 (€).	8.
“ “ (2).	18; 41; 77; 147; 272; 327 (€); 352; 710; 736 (€); 858 (€); 951; 1027; 1055 (€); 1128; 1149 (€); 1283; 1478.	17.
Trachin. (1).	1072 (€) 1078 (€); 1186 (€).	3.
“ (2).	39 (€); 62; 162; 184; 189 (€); 256; 260 (€); 306; 364; 433; 445; 462; 482; 544; 554 (€); 594; 740 (€); 820 (€); 922 (€); 1252.	20.
Philoct. (1).	57 (€); 568 (€); 1000 (€); 1299 (€); 1342 (τᾶδε followed by double cons.).	5.
“ (2).	298; 471 (€); 491 (€); 591 (€); 769; 792; 795; 802; 868; 919; 989; 1003 (€); 1008 (€); 1375 (€); 1388; 1431; 1434 (€).	17.
Oed. Col. (1).	6 (€); 54 (€); 1028 (€); 1435 (€).	4.
“ “ (2).	29; 64; 96; 111; 450; 653 (€); 749; 803; 811; 864; 1002 (€); 1005 (€); 1007 (€); 1032; 1102; 1356 (€); 1367 (€); 1434; 1547.	19.

This foot like the third shows an excess of the emphatic pronouns, and the types are similar to those there discussed. The first type is rare. The second is aided by the recurrence of the ending such as τόνδε τὸν πόνον, τοῦδε τοῦ πόνου, etc., where the insertion of the article allows a pleasing cadence and makes the measurement easy with any pyrrhic or iambic word in the last foot. This cadence may haply have something to do with the use of the article with this pronoun in tragedy, seeing that the

article is much more widely used when the pronoun precedes than when it follows, the numbers being 101 instances when the demonstrative precedes and only 38 when it follows.

Οὗτος in this foot presents only one type,

Ajax 535. ἀλλ' οὖν ἐχὼ 'φύλαξα τοῦτό γ' ἀρέσκει.

These have the following distribution:

Ajax 535; 661 (€); 979 (€); 1134 (€); 1271 (€).	5.
Antigone 84; 98; 296; 439 (€); 650; 706 (€).	6.
Electra 84; 620; 910 (€); 1008 (€); 1150 (€); 1176 (€); 1215; 1504.	8.
Oed. Tyr. 129 (€); 287 (€); 370 (€); 449; 766 (€); 1044; 1071; 1150; 1156; 1512 (€).	10.
Trachin. 289; 295; 413; 455; 475.	5.
Philoct. 11; 289 (€); 422; 596; 642 (€); 875 (€); 975 (€); 1024 (€).	8.
Oed. Col. 269 (€); 359 (€); 431 (€); 1035 (€); 1177 (€); 1262 (τούτοισιν); 1406. ¹	

This is a fairly respectable showing for *οὗτος* considering the fact that only one type occurs. It is to be noted that the oblique cases of *οὗτος* could not possibly be used here with the article in such types as *τοῦδε τοῦ πόνου*, save the accusatives singular masculine and neuter, and nom. and acc. neuter plural. We might have such types as *οὗτος ὁ φθόνος*, *τοῦτο τὸ ξίφος*, *τοῦτον τὸν φθόνον*, *ταῦτα τὰ ξίφη*, which however, never occurs in Sophocles. These

¹It may be observed here that Jebb in *Oed. Col.*, 1406, alters *τοῦδ'* to *ταῦτ'* with Sehrwald and Wecklein. He gives as one ground for the alteration "the threefold *τοῦδ'* in these lines exceeds the limit of probable repetition." Except for the same case, this reason will not hold, for we find *δε* in three successive verses in *Antigone* 384-5-6, Aesch. *Pers.* 437-8-9, *Agam.* 933-4-5, Eur. *Alc.* 7-8-9, and what is more two in the ninth verse: we also find one in 728 and two in 729 and three successive in 1126-7-8. These are not in the same case, it is true, but it does not seem likely that this would be especially offensive. Compare Aesch. *Agam.* 1034 *πεῖθοι' ἄν — εἰ πεῖθοι ἀπειθολὴς δ' ἴσως*. The Greeks were not so sensitive to the repetition of like sounds or like words as the moderns are.

facts certainly make it clear that the forms of *ὄδε* fall more readily into this foot and we can hardly doubt that a poet would on occasion avail himself of this opportunity.

Ἐκεῖνος here also affords two types:

1. Ajax 94. *καλῶς ἔλεξας, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνό μοι φράσον.*
2. Trachin. 614. *καὶ τῶνδ' ἀποίσεις σῆμ, ὃ κείνος εὐμαθὲς etc.*

The distribution of these is as follows:

Ajax (1).	94.	1.
" (2).	None.	0.
Antigone (1).	None.	0.
" (2).	None.	0.
Electra (1).	2 (ε); 270; 321.	3.
" (2).	None.	0.
Oed. Tyr. (1).	259; 720; 1020.	3.
" " (2).	None.	0.
Trachin. (1).	381.	1.
" (2).	614.	1.
Philoct. (2).	None.	0.
Oed. Col. (1).	304.	1.
" " (2).	None.	0.

Ἐκεῖνος is very rare in this position and in two plays, the *Antigone* and *Philoctetes*, does not occur at all in this foot. It may not be out of place here to remark that, while such a cadence as *τοῦδε τοῦ πόνου* is out of the question in this foot save under the conditions noted above under *οὔτος*, the form *τοῦ πόνου*, etc. can, of course, occur with both *τούτου* and *ἐκείνου* in some other foot, and it may perhaps be well to add that the majority of instances in which *οὔτος* is used with the articular substantive shows the *οὔτος* separated from them.

In the fifth foot again each pronoun shows two types:

Ὅδε shows here the following:

1. Ajax 544. *καὶ δὴ κομίζει προσπόλων ὄδ' ἐγγύθεν.*
2. Ajax 526. *θέλοιμ' ἄν· αἰνοίης γὰρ ἂν τὰ τῆσδ' ἔπη.*

The distribution of these is as follows:

Ajax (1).	544 (€); 1136 (€).	2.
“ (2).	526 (€); 833; 1104.	3.
Antigone (1).	910 (€).	1.
“ (2).	578.	1.
Electra (1).	295 (€); 405 (€); 450 (€); 541 (€); 777; 779 (€); 1105; 1470 (€); 1489 (€); 1493 (€).	10.
“ (2).	264; 376; 421 (€); 1499.	4.
Oed. Tyr. (1).	219 (€); 343 (€); 407; 732 (€); 912 (€); 945 (€); 968 (€); 1172 (€).	8.
“ “ (2).	47; 253; 297; 404 (€); 620; 677 (€); 857 (€); 949 (€); 1148 (€); 1177 (€); 1419.	11.
Trachin. (1).	23 (€).	1.
“ (2).	716 (€); 801.	2.
Philoct. (1).	783 (€); 978; 1001 (€); 1019 (€).	4.
“ (2).	429; 528; 577; 581; 807; 1047 (€); 1339; 1367.	8.
Oed. Col. (1).	67 (€); 109 (€); 505 (€); 787 (€); 823; 905 (€); 953 (€); 1138 (€); 1178 (€); 1379.	10.
“ “ (2).	36; 294; 452; 1020 (€); 1121; 1141 (€); 1255 (€); 1407 (€); 1432 (€).	10.

There is little to note here save that the first and second halves of the foot nearly equal each other, the first showing 30 occurrences, the second 39. We might also call attention to the very few instances in the *Antigone* and the *Trachinians*.

The two types of οὗτος in this foot are as follows:

1. *Antigone* 35. οὐχ ὥς παρ' οὐδὲν ἀλλ' ὅς ἄν τούτων τι δρᾷ
2. *Ajax* 1087. ἔρπει παραλλάξ ταῦτα πρόσθεν οὗτος ἦν.

The distribution is as follows:

Ajax (1).	None.	0.
“ (2).	1087.	1.
Antigone (1).	35; 39; 189; 484; 519.	5.
“ (2).	324.	1.
Electra (1).	371; 409 (€); 578; 675.	4.
“ (2).	315 (€); 591 (€); 877 (€).	3.

Oed. Tyr. (1).	429; 520; 1036; 1055; 1385.	5.
“ “ (2).	460 (€); 529; 860 (€); 982 (€); 1180.	5.
Trachin. (1).	344; 362; 428; 431.	4.
“ (2).	467; 490.	2.
Philoct. (1).	392; 521; 585; 618; 1075; 1078; 1359; 1435.	8.
“ (2).	438; 981.	2.
Oed. Col. (1).	396; 859; 904; 1142; 1149; 1300; 1357.	7.
“ “ (2).	490; 935.	2.

As the caesura plays but little part in this foot, there is no objection to filling the foot with one word and so we find the first type exceeding the second. Moreover, the second type occurs only when the last word is a monosyllable or when the final syllable of the pronoun could be elided. The percentages of this foot are very close, *ὅδε* varying from 2 to 13, while *οὗτος* varies from 2 to 13. Beyond this there is little of interest to be noted.

The two types of *ἐκείνος* are seen in the following:

1. Ajax 472. *μήποτε φύσιν γ' ἄσπλαχνος ἐκ κείνου γεγάς*
2. Electra 1365. *Ἀγαμέμνωνος, πῶς ἦλθες; ἦ σὺ κείνος εἶ;*

They are thus distributed:

Ajax (1).	472; 966; 970.	3.
“ (2).	None.	0.
Antigone (1).	71; 168; 489; 748.	4.
“ (2).	None.	0.
Electra (1).	459; 577; 908; 924; 925; 1118.	6.
“ (2).	1355.	1.
Oed. Tyr. (1).	261; 714; 928.	3.
“ “ (2).	None.	0.
Philoct. (1).	115; 338; 365; 583; 625; 1028.	6.
“ (2).	None.	0.
Oed. Col. (1).	336; 606; 793.	3.
“ “ (2).	None.	0.

There is little worth observing here. It may be remarked, however, that the percentages of *ἐκείνος* in this foot range from 11 to 26, which is just a little higher than that of the other two demonstratives.

In the sixth foot two types are possible for *ὅδε* but only one seems to be found. The second type would require elision at the end of the trimeter, which does not occur in this word.

The type is seen in the following,

1. Ajax 22. *ἔχει περάνας, εἵπερ εἴργασται τάδε.*

The distribution is as follows:

Ajax. 22; 44 (ε); 77 (ε); 368; 459; 534; 687; 733; 797; 1238; 1280.	11.
Antigone 66; 87; 219; 248; 294; 302; 397; 442; 447; 450; 521; 685; 692; 748; 1073.	15.
Electra 4; 7; 10; 258 (ε); 461; 465; 651; 661; 795; 909; 921; 1025; 1029; 1119; 1124; 1177; 1180; 1216; 1375; 1457.	20.
Oed. Tyr. 223; 234; 354; 401; 538; 568; 599; 646; 850; 948; 1050; 1064; 1294; 1416; 1449; 1476.	16.
Trachin. 190; 355; 367; 581; 716; 928; 935; 1082 (ε); 1108; 1247; 1257.	11.
Philoct. 36; 37; 132; 305; 372; 539; 597; 767; 822; 898; 980; 994; 1003; 1235; 1242; 1246; 1250; 1287; 1362; 1368; 1384.	21.
Oed. Col. 22; 32; 342; 416; 478; 480; 497; 587; 644; 820; 852; 961; 987; 1031; 1128; 1136; 1253; 1513; 1524.	19.

It is in this foot that *ὅδε* shows the greatest excess over *οὗτος* in as much as it offers itself as a willing tag-piece or stop-gap¹ at any time, even when there is no emphasis to be observed.

Ἐκεῖνος shows no example in the sixth foot, and *οὗτος* shows only one, which, as above stated, is probably unique. It is as follows:

(*Oed. Tyr.* 332.) *ἐγὼ οὗτ' ἐμαυτὸν οὔτε σ' ἀलगυνῶ. τί ταῦτ'.*

¹ Compare Earle on Eur. *Med.* 736. "Ἐμέ: hardly specially emphatic. The longer form seems to be used here, as elsewhere, to fill out the last foot of the trimeter."